

Remarks

I. Administrative Overview

Claims 1-24 were previously presented of which Claims 1 and 13 are independent. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections levied against the pending claims. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,484,206 to Crump et al. (“Crump”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,010,300 to Jones et al. (“Jones”) and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,065,120 to Laursen et al. (“Laursen”). Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-24 as previously presented are patentable over any combination of Crump, Jones and Laursen.

Obviousness is demonstrated when a cited reference either alone or in combination with an additional reference, teaches or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of Crump, Jones and Laursen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

The Examiner admits that both Crump and Laursen fail to teach or suggest “linking, after the ticket is validated, the re-established first connection to the maintained second connection,” as required by independent Claims 1 and 13. (*See* Office Action mailed on September 10, 2008, pages 3-4.) Applicants submit that Jones also fails to teach or suggest “linking, after the ticket is validated, the re-established first connection to the maintained second connection,” as required by independent Claims 1 and 13. Jones describes a system for allowing two mobile devices to transmit data back and forth through a central gateway. (*See* Jones, Abstract; FIG. 1 and accompanying text.) The hand-off between the mobile station and either of the two mobile devices occurs when a first mobile device transmits data, and that data is intercepted by a mobile switch center which routes the data to the gateway. The gateway then does the following: receives the data; converts the data into Enhanced Variable Rate Coder data; encapsulates the converted data; and sends the encapsulated data to a second mobile device. *See* Jones, col. 28, lines 7-63. Jones does not teach or suggest linking a re-established first connection with a

second connection, much less doing so after a ticket is validated. For this reason, Jones fails to teach or suggest each and every element of Claims 1 and 13. Thus, Claims 1 and 13 are patentable over any combination of Crump, Jones and Laursen. Claims 2-12 and 14-24 are also patentable over any combination of Crump, Jones and Laursen because Claims 2-12 and 14-24 are dependent on Claims 1 and 13, respectively.

For the above-mentioned reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw all rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

III. Conclusion

Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and that all of the pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' agent would expedite prosecution of this application; the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' agent at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP

Date: December 10, 2008

/Kellan D. Ponikiewicz/
Kellan D. Ponikiewicz
Registration Number: 59,701

Patent Group
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 502-5002